

Board Retreat (Tuesday, June 23, 2015)

Generated by Shelley R Shelton on Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Members present

Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Michelle Kaufusi, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

Staff members present

Keith C. Rittel, Superintendent; Gary Wilson, Assistant Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Dr. Gary Wall, Executive Director Human Resources; Jason Cox, Director Human Resources; Alex Judd, Executive Director of Elementary Education; Anne-Marie Harrison, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning; Shelley Shelton, Executive Assistant

Guests

Dr. Todd McKee, Timpview High School Principal; Karen Brown, Provo High School Principal; Mitch Swenson, Centennial Middle School Principal; Jarod Sites, Dixon Middle School Principal; John Anderson, Dixon Middle School Assistant Principal; Lani Quisenberry, Independence High School Principal

Meeting called to order at 8:16 AM

A. 8:00 a.m. Study Session

1. Welcome: President Julie Rash

2. Roll Call

3. School Fees Discussion with Principals; School Budgets/Oversight

Supt. Keith Rittel introduced the subject of what schools are charging for school fees. The Board had previously expressed an interest in the philosophy behind school fees, which are presented to the board annually for approval in the spring. Talking points included the following:

- One potential additional school fee is anticipated in the next few years for technology devices. After paying the fee for 2-3 years, the student would own the device. That would alleviate the need for the district to purchase all student devices. On the other hand, it raises the question about whether we can continue to add fees to those already being charged.
- Board members are concerned about the discrepancy between the Timpview and Provo High fees charged for the same offerings, both for classes and for extracurricular activities. The disparity may come from how the class fee is viewed by teachers. THS Administration has worked to reduce that disparity over the past four years. It may be time to look at school fund balances to see how much of the fee burden could possibly be lifted from parents and covered by the school.
- Rather than charging families the maximum they can tolerate in school fees, the discussion needs to center on charging the minimum needed to run programs. 56% of the student population district-wide is on free/reduced lunch, making it very difficult for those families with middle- and high school-age students.
- If schools were to have a reduction in the fees charged, at what point could they go no lower and still run programs?
 - At this point Timpview has not determined what is essential and what is enrichment. Students pay a fee just to take a class; what's that money going to be used for? In most cases it's for essentials, i.e., workbooks, art supplies or equipment student will take home, etc. In other cases it appears to be discretionary operational money teachers are collecting for cultural enrichment, field trips, etc.

- Provo High: There's an existing textbook dilemma. Many textbooks are too old and teachers are going to a workbook format instead, paid for by class fees.
- The culture surrounding fees is a highly political issue directly related to under-funding of education by the state. The legislature feels they're funding the basic education of students and everything else is extracurricular and a parental responsibility.
- There's a need for a clear definition of what does/doesn't constitute a class fee; fees collected for a class go to that specific class.
- Field trips should be funded from the principals discretionary budget rather than from school fees.
- Todd is currently paying approximately \$25,000 from his discretionary budget for athletic team travel. Can the fund balance in the activities budget cover that cost?
- Member Jensen distributed a listing of fees collected in Alpine School District for review.

The Board's discussion will be pre-planning for the school fee review next spring.

After the discussion, the following was determined:

- The Board directed Supt. Rittel to meet with secondary principals to draft a common definition of critical school fees, how they've been used in the past and a plan for future use, and determine a clear distinction between class fees and extracurricular fees. An analysis of athletic gate receipts vs. the expenses of the sports programs will also be provided.
- The board's discussion of fees will continue during the September 2015 board retreat.
- The deadline for making changes to the 2016-2017 fees is March 1, 2016.

4. PHS Construction: Facilities Director Mark Wheeler

Facilities Director Mark Wheeler shared current challenges with the PHS construction site.

- At the start of the construction process, the board had a bond budget of \$55 million. The district was looking at approximately 290,000 sq. ft. of new square footage. The current school is approximately 303,000 sq. ft. sitting on 29 acres. Enrollment is approximately 1,950. By comparison, Timpview is 393,000 sq. ft. on 37 acres with an enrollment of approximately 2,000.
- The current layout for the rebuild as designed by FFKR Architects is approximately 320,000 sq. ft., including the renovation of "E" wing. This is much more square footage than the original plan, potentially putting the project about \$10 million over budget.
- Even with the additional 30,000 sq. ft., there is not enough space to meet some program needs, including a shortage of classroom space for Special Ed.
- With the current space limitations and potentially being over budget, the baseball field is no longer a possibility.
- Once the three-story academic wing is complete, "we have zero room for expansion, not even for a portable." Provo High is sitting within the boundary of the area with the most projected growth over the next 40 years in the northwest and southwest corners of the city.
- The plans have been sent to Provo City for their engineering department to conduct plan reviews. The City's comments included concerns about being 130 parking spaces short as per City ordinance, even after the latest adjustments. There are also concerns related to separating the playing fields from the practice facilities.
- The possibility of acquiring neighboring land parcels either through purchase or eminent domain would allow for some shifting of the tennis court location to provide more parking space.

Possible Solutions:

- Study a boundary change
- Include a fourth story
- Westside land bank option
 - Land bank property would provide about 350,000 square feet. The building would be about \$70-75 million to completely build. Would require sale of current PHS site.
- Move PUPS out of PHS and back to middle schools
 - A move would free up 2 or 3 classrooms or more

- Move the district office location
 - Mark would need to study the cost of moving the district office and utilizing the current district office site as part of the PHS site.
- Relocate or eliminate programs

Following additional discussion of the pros and cons of building on either site, the general consensus was as follows:

- Rebuild PHS on its current site, covering the cost overruns from the fund balance that we're adding a little to each year, and creatively manage boundaries and programs. The potential exists to sell the Grandview site for between \$5-10 million, as well as possibly enforce eminent domain on the corner properties on southeast / northeast corners of the PHS parking area.

5. OCR Rules & Regulations: Asst. Supt. Gary Wilson

Asst. Supt. Gary Wilson led the OCR discussion, stating the presentation has to do with where the district needs to be compliant with civil rights. The Provo City School District, like most districts, is currently behind in civil rights policies to one degree or another according to the Office of Civil Rights.

What Federal Civil Rights Laws Apply to School Districts

School districts need to be very diligent in their compliance with the following laws:

1. Title VI - Prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origins
2. Title IX - Prohibits discrimination based on sex
3. Section 504 - Prohibits discrimination based on disability

"Section 504" Update

1. Complete rewrite of Provo City School District 504 qualification paperwork
2. Summer 2014 training and on-going training efforts
3. Summer 2015 internal school audits
4. Summer 2015 "Mitigating Factor Training"

Once the trainings are complete, the district will be in complete compliance with 504 law.

Upon board member request, Mr. Wilson explained the difference between an IEP (Individualized Education Plan) and a 504 plan:

- An IEP student needs specialized instruction related to a low IQ.
- A 504 student needs access accommodations, such as a wheelchair ramp, elevator, etc.

Policy Development 2015/2016

Several "required" policies by law are needed within the district:

1. Non-discrimination policy
2. Section 504 policy
3. Title IX policy

Key Trainings for Principals and Administrators 2015-2016

1. Sexual Violence Investigations

- The investigation process is very detailed according to Title IX in how it is to be conducted. Posters with district contact information must be placed in each school according to OCR regulations. Witness statements must be taken; the victim must state what he/she feels is the correct resolution of the particular incident. The investigator would agree/disagree with the proposed resolution, justifying the reason for the agreement/disagreement. The complainant may take the matter a step further if desired. Principals will receive training to be the school-level investigator. If the victim or the victim's parents do not want the investigation to take place at the school level the matter goes to Mr. Wilson as the Asst. Supt. /Executive Director of Student Services.

2. Title IX Complaints

- Some complaints will deal with athletics. There is a three-pronged determination of Title IX compliance regarding athletics:
 - An equal number of girls and boys are playing sports, which will never happen anywhere in the country.
 - Survey students every three years to determine what they're asking for in terms of the sports offered. The district would then determine what sports can/can't be offered, and provide a reason if the sport can't be offered, such as financial limitations, etc. The district/school would then be in compliance regardless of whether or not the sport is offered.
 - There must be an equal number of sports offered for both boys and girls, regardless of the number of participants.

OCR Guidance

"Dear Colleague Letter" Apr. 24, 2015

Letters from OCR are received periodically. Excerpts from the April 24, 2015 letter were discussed:

- “. . . Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits discrimination based on sex in education programs and activities in federally funded schools at all levels. If any part of a school district or college receives any Federal funds for any purpose, all of the operations of the district or college are covered by Title IX. Title IX protects students, employees, applicants for admission and employment, and other persons from all forms of sex discrimination based on gender identity or failure to conform to stereotypical notions of masculinity or femininity. All students (as well as other persons) at recipient institutions are protected by Title IX - regardless of their sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, part- or full-time status, disability, race, or national origin - in all aspects of a recipient's educational programs and activities. . .”
 - The "Dear Colleague Letter" was the first time this was issued in a formal, written notice, even though it's been in effect for years. In every instance, Title IX rules in favor of the complainant.

Implications of OCR Guidance

1. New building construction

- Must include "family restrooms" with locking doors.

2. Existing buildings

- Situations will be dealt with as they come up if someone claims a transgender identity.
- Transgender individuals, if they advance a claim, can not be told to use a restroom in a certain area, which singles them out and is discriminatory. They could, however, use a staff restroom.

3. Review of UHSAA suggested transgender policy: Gary distributed copies of the suggested policy, which is geared toward protecting against discrimination.

Gender identity and whether or not a student claims transgender identity.

- There must be a history of student identifying him/herself as specific gender. The student would then have the legal right to participate in a sport as the gender he/she identifies with.
- The policy was proceeded by the case of a student who currently identifies himself as a female, is currently trans-gendering to a female, and wants to play on the girls soccer team. He's been denied the chance to play on the girls team and is suing.
- District policy must be ready to address the issue if it arises.
- The word "sex" within the policy will include everything the law says it has to include, and we have to be compliant with it.

7. NSBA Follow-up & Planning: Julie Rash

It was determined the board will not attend the National School Boards Conference (NSBA) in Boston in 2016, but will attend the conference in Denver in 2017.

8. Board Handbook: Julie Rash

President Julie Rash indicated discussions should be held on the following items briefly now and in more depth at a later date.

- Roles of the superintendent and the role of board: what is the best way to approach the superintendent (or other administrators) with specific concerns/issues?
- How much of the superintendent's time should be occupied responding to individual board member requests?
- Superintendent/business administrator evaluations

The following points of clarification were made:

- The board's role is to create policy; the superintendent's role is to implement policy. We have board goals and need to make sure we're continuing on that course.
- How should Keith handle issues brought by individual board members without hijacking his time and/or the board's mission?
 - Is the board member presenting a new initiatives/interests?
 - Is the board member speaking for the board or for him/herself?
 - The board needs to recognize the position individual issues may place Keith in.
 - Supt. Rittel can ask a board member if they've spoken with other members when they come to him with an issue.
 - Supt. Rittel can email the rest of the board with questions/concerns from single board members.
 - If Board members need specific information from a department, it's recommended the board members make the initial request of the superintendent, He in turn will steer the board member in the appropriate direction.
 - If someone wants something on the agenda, make sure three other board members also want it on the agenda.
- Principals are required to talk to Keith directly if they have an issue with him prior to going to a board member. Board members were urged to ask principals if they've already spoken to Keith if they approach a board member with an issue or concern.
- Board members have a tendency to get caught up in the minutia of district operations rather than allowing Keith and principals to do their jobs.
 - The balance needs to be found; solve issues at the very lowest level but don't leave Keith out of the loop.
- Supt. Rittel asked Board members to not ask principals what they would want if they could ask for anything after principals have made a school presentation. It potentially sets Keith or other district administrators up as "the bad guy" if the principal has already made a request that was denied for some reason.
- Member McKay Jensen and President Julie Rash recommended council members evaluate board members according to the board goals in the following areas:
 - "Powerful Practices" - Items board members are doing very well.
 - "Opportunities for Enrichment" - Optional ways board members could push things they're doing well to an even higher level.
 - "Satisfactory Performance"
 - "Required Actions"
 - The topic will be further discussed during the September 2015 board retreat.
- Board members should make appointments to discuss items with the superintendent or council members.
- Board members should remember they're a unit and not hijack/circumvent each other.
- While they feel very supported by the Board, Supt. Rittel and Business Administrator Stefanie Bryant requested that they never be blindsided by a concern at the time of their evaluations by the board.

It was determined that Member Marsha Judkins will work on updating the board handbook. President Julie Rash will work on the board and administrator evaluation processes.

9. Policy 4115 Gifted and Talented and Procedure

Due to concerns expressed regarding the existing philosophy behind the district's Gifted and Talented program as it's been managed in the past, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning Anne-Marie Harrison offered the following background on the program.

- The district GT program has been developed by a smaller group of very vocal people, so it's developed into a certain model that is very attentive to serving students who are advanced. The emphasis tends to be on the "gifted" aspect, while "talented" and "advanced" have somewhat different meanings. There are certain programs that need to be looked at specifically. There are many ways to look at gifted education, and part of it's going to depend on how the board helps set the district's philosophy. Programs can then be developed from that philosophy.
- John Hattie has three primary research areas devoted to gifted/talented education in his book, *Visible Learning*:
 - Acceleration - giving kids the same curriculum, just faster. This method by far has the greatest strength with a .88 effect size.
 - Ability Grouping - Has a .39 effect size.
 - Enrichment - students are not given the same curriculum faster, they're given broader, different curriculum, with a .30 effect size.
- The GT program has been administered with the philosophy of separating G/T students from other students, giving them their own space and identity. Complex patterns of identification have been used over the last 3-4 years. While the PUP (Provo Unlimited Progress) magnet program was originally created several years ago to serve gifted and talented middle school students who weren't being served in the middle schools, there's a big concern generally about the program. Parents and teachers want PUPs removed from Provo High School and returned to the middle schools. New middle school administrators are anxious to have the program return to their schools.
- A good percentage of CAS (Center for Accelerated Students) elementary students choose to go to the middle school rather than to the PUP program at Provo High.

Following a discussion of the aspects of the program that board members have concerns with, it was determined the District will develop a plan for the gifted and talented programs and present to the board in December.

10. 12:15 - 12:30 2016-2017 Calendar & Survey Results: HR Exec Dir. Dr. Gary Wall

Objective of this discussion: to learn of the online survey results for the 2016-2017 calendar proposal.

Executive Director of Human Resources Dr. Gary Wall outlined 180-day calendar options. Calendar A was preferred by 73%. Board members will provide feedback to HR for a calendar meeting with BYU and UVU in Oct. The board supports calendar "A" for board approval in December.

Member Kaufusi was excused at approximately 1:00 p.m.

12. 1:00 - 1:45 Cyber Safety: JP Pontious and Jonathan Smith, Tech Support (45 min.)

JP Pontious from Tech Support presented options for internet filtering district wide.

Difference between Vimeo and YouTube

-YouTube allows up to NC17 and offers an option to filter adult content. (YouTube Safety Mode.) NC17 = No children 17 and under Admitted. R= Restricted - under 17 requires accompanying parent or adult guardian.

Why are we being forced to come up with a solution to filter YouTube and Google?

-Between January 2012 and Fall of 2014 - the introduction of encrypted Google and eventually YouTube encrypted and secured the searches of users but also hid the searches from web filters. This makes it difficult to block keyword searches. The strategy, until fall of 2014, was to block access to encrypted Google and YouTube which forced the user to use the http (unencrypted) site. Now that Google is forcing all YouTube traffic to https (encrypted), web filters are unable to see the keyword searches and unable to block unwanted searches to force YouTube safety mode.

Elementary Schools

The superintendent has directed us to make reasonable efforts to filter at the elementary level.

-Enable YouTube Safety Mode - This option uses our DNS servers to redirect YouTube traffic to 216.239.38.120 (forcesafesearch.google.com). It will result in YouTube access with safety mode locked on.

- Statement from Google - safety mode hides videos that may contain inappropriate content flagged by user and other signals. No filter is 100% accurate, but it should help you avoid most inappropriate content.

Secondary Schools:

We will not filter at the secondary level. However we will coordinate with schools, school PTAs and school community councils to work on cyber safety and internet ethics.

Turn on SSL decryption - This option gives us more visibility, but not full visibility, and enables the filter to force student YouTube access to cleanvideosearch.co and block bad keywords.

Option 1: SSL Decryption from the web filter - must touch all devices or rely on the users to install the decryption certificate. Client Management solution.

Option 2: \$50,000+ for the SourceFire appliance to decrypt all traffic.

- Both options open us up to security risk if our firewall, the SourceFire appliance or web filter are compromised.
- With either options we would start our decrypting Google traffic.
- Train all teachers/staff on filtering at the beginning of the year through Tech Talk and other means.

Board direction:

The district needs to be able to see what's happening on our network.

It's suggested that Tech Support share data with parents about the number of hits on certain sites during the day.

Teachers can still use YouTube on safety mode.

Board members agreed Tech Support should follow option 2. House Bill 213 puts a lot of emphasis for training on community councils. Everyone will also be filtered at home if using a district-owned device.

Related information not on the agenda:

President Julie Rash: Zions Bank will fund the Fight the New Drug presentations at high schools if the district will pay a \$50 booking fee. Board members agreed to have Supt. Rittel get the process started.

13. District App: Jonathan Smith, Tech Support

Jonathan Smith from Tech Support demonstrated the new community app he's developing to replace the ParentLink community app the district has purchased the last several years. The new district app will be community-driven and school specific. Patrons may select the school(s) they wish to subscribe to and receive alerts and news feeds from district social media sites, school calendars, school meal, student meal information from Child Nutrition, student information from PowerSchool, and district policies.

The ParentLink contract expires July 1. Jonathan is hoping to have the district app ready this week to send to Apple for approval. Jonathan is having someone develop the Android version.

ParentLink will remain in use for call-outs regarding absences, etc.

14. District Improvement Plan: Supt. Keith Rittel & Dr. John Wilkinson

Keith gave the background of the district improvement plan and introduced Dr. John Wilkinson, who led the development process and briefly described the steps for board members.

In February of 2015, Supt. Rittel invited outside consultant Dr. John Wilkinson to facilitate the work of a district improvement planning committee consisting of teachers, principals, and district staff. The Superintendent's charge was to produce a plan for the success of every student based on proven, research-based factors and aligned with board goals for the district.

Superintendent Rittel defined the "aim" for the district improvement plan. *"Every student will end each school year having met or exceeded the essential learning standards, fully prepared for the next grade/course."*

The question of how to achieve the aim was posed to a district improvement planning committee. District and school administrators and teachers participated, studied and chose high-impact factors defined in John Hattie's *Visible Learning*. From this summary of highly effective educational practices the committee developed priorities for professional learning. The question of what to focus on first involved decisions about resources, past investment in professional learning, and the potential for high impact on all students was answered by the district council where the emphasis for the first year was defined.

The dedication and expertise of the professional educators on the committee has been central to the success of the planning process.

Talking points included:

How the Plan Was Developed

- Continuous Renewal and Improvement
 - Where are we now?
 - Where do we want to be?
 - What does that look like?
 - How do we make it happen?
- The Planning Process
 - Understanding "Effect Size"
 - John Hattie's Visible Learning Factors
 - How Highest Effect-Size Factors were Selected: Examples by Category
 - Planning Process Timeline and Milestones
- Overview of Plan Development Process Phases
 - Phase 1: Team members studied Hattie's work in study teams, listed priorities for their category
 - Phase 2: Study Visible Learning categories; prioritize do/do not list of factors
 - Phase 3: Re-prioritize do/do not list of factors
 - Phase 4: Develop objectives for prioritized factors
 - Phase 5: Provide feedback on all factors and objectives of other study teams
 - Phase 6: Study teams draft learning activities for objectives
 - Phase 7: Final committee meeting to consider these questions:
 - Why are we doing this?
 - Do the objectives make sense?
 - Does the phrasing make sense?
 - What is missing? Help fill in blanks.
 - What do we need to stop doing?
 - Check for redundancy and clarity.
 - How do we regularly update the plan?
 - How do we frequently report on and communicate progress?
- Avoid Initiative Fatigue - Commit to Continuous Renewal

- Teachers may have the feeling that improvement initiatives don't last, so there is no urgency to adopt them. There will be something new "tomorrow."
- The District Improvement Plan is conceived and developed to be a "living" document that focuses on long-term implementation of factors that have proven themselves over time. They will be implemented, measured and improved upon over a long period of time.
- Building on Learning Targets
- Overcoming the Twin Sins of Teaching
 - Activity-based teaching: planning activities without defining the desired learning result in advance.
 - Coverage-based teaching: marching through the text or curriculum with the goal to get through it rather than learn it.
 - The district improvement plan will provide the pathway to overcome the twin sins where needed, making learning visible and achieving the district aim of "every student will end each school year having met or exceeded the essential learning standards, fully prepared for the next grade/course."

Executive Director of Teaching and Learning Anne-Marie Harrison indicated differentiated professional development will be provided for teachers who are familiar / not as familiar with Hattie's *Visible Learning*.

Dr. Wilkinson encouraged board member to review their copy of the published plan.

Member Shannon Poulsen was excused at 2:55 p.m.

15. Dual Immersion: Asst. Supt. Gary Wilson; Executive Director of Elementary Ed. Alex Judd

Assistant Supt. Gary outlined the draft Dual Immersion plan for 2015-2016 as follows. The board is willing to approve a related dual immersion policy and procedure once they're drafted.

The success of Dual Immersion within our schools has created unique problems that must be addressed to alleviate grade level overcrowding, expenses and school capacity issues. The plan listed below is in draft format and has not been presented to Council, Principals or the School Board to date. The initial thinking is that this plan would become mandatory for the 2016/2017 school year and highly recommended where possible for the 2015/2016 school year.

A. **NUMBER OF STUDENTS / NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS IN A DUAL IMMERSION SCHOOL**

1. Number of Students in a Beginning Dual Immersion Grade Level (K or 1)

30 Students Required

2. Number of Classrooms of Dual Immersion

2 Classrooms Required

3. Number of Students in a Beginning English Grade Level (K or 1)

22 Students Recommended

24 Students Maximum

4. Number of Classrooms of English

2 Classrooms Required

5. If a school has additional classrooms to support additional classes they may add the classes and long as the school can provide space for the additional years and possible classrooms that may follow. The school must maintain the minimum of two English classrooms.

B. **STAFFING RATIOS**

1. Dual Immersion (30 to 1)

- 1 Teacher
- 1 Classroom Aide

2. English (22 to 1)

- 1 Teacher

C. SELECTION OF STUDENTS FOR DUAL IMMERSION (Beginning Grade)

1. In-Boundary Definition – A student is considered “in-boundary” if they either live in the neighborhood boundaries of the school or if they were accepted as a choice student in a prior year and have attended that school for at least one year.
2. In-Boundary Students Selected for Dual Immersion = **80%**
3. Out-of-Boundary Definition – A student who lives in the Provo City School District and resides in a neighborhood other than the school they are applying to attend. (They also have not met minimum one year attendance requirement).
4. Out-of-Boundary Students Selected for Dual Immersion = **20%**
5. Non-District Resident Definition – The family lives outside of the Provo City School District Boundaries.
6. Non-District Resident Students Selected for Dual Immersion = **0**
(Exceptions may be made for siblings of current Non-District Residents if and only if space is available.)
7. Non-District Resident Students may be accepted into English classes if space is available.

D. PROCESS FOR SELECTING IN-BOUNDARY STUDENTS INTO DUAL IMMERSION

1. In-Boundary Students 80% - the school accepts DLI applications for all interested in-boundary students. Application deadline is March 15.
2. All in-boundary completed applications will be divided into three priority categories:
 - a. Siblings of students currently in the Dual Immersion Program
 - b. Language Proficient Students
 - c. All others
3. The three in-boundary lists will then be sent to the IT Department. The IT department will then do a “random generated” list ranking for each of the priority categories. Students will be selected as follows:
 - a. In-Boundary Siblings (until 80% reached)
 - b. In-Boundary Language Proficient Students (until 80% reached)
 - c. In-Boundary Others (until 80% reached)
4. All in-boundary students not accepted into the DLI program will automatically be put into an English class and their boundary school.

E. PROCESS FOR SELECTING OUT-OF-BOUNDARY CHOICE STUDENTS INTO A SCHOOL THAT OFFERS DUAL-IMMERSION

1. Out-of Boundary students must come to the Student Services Office and complete a choice application. If they wish to be considered for dual immersion they must complete a Dual Immersion Form too.
2. Out-of-Boundary applications will be divided into the following priority groups
 - a. Out-of-Boundary Child or Grandchild of an Employee at the School
 - b. Out-of Boundary Sibling
 - c. Out-of-District Sibling

- d. Out-of Boundary all others
 - e. Out-of-District all others
 3. The five out-of-boundary lists will be sent to IT Department. The IT Department will then do a "random generated" list ranking for each priority category.

F. PROCESS FOR SELECTING OUT-OF-BOUNDARY STUDENTS INTO DUAL IMMERSION

1. Out-of-Boundary Students 20% - the Student Services Office will accept both "Choice" and DLI applications from families living outside the selected school boundaries.
2. All completed out-of-boundary applications will be divided into three priority categories:
 - a. Out-of-Boundary Siblings (until 20% reached)
 - b. Out-of-Boundary Language Proficient Students (until 20% reached)
 - c. Out-of- Boundary Others (until 20% reached)
3. Out-of-Boundary students not selected into DLI will then be eligible for English classes based on the priority rankings generated from letter "E listed" above and in consideration of space availability.
4. If an out-of-boundary parent is offered either a DLI or English class slot the following options are available to the parent:
 - a. Accept the choice: Acceptance will then eliminate choices from other schools the parent may have also requested "choice".
 - b. Deny the choice: If denied the parent will then be eligible for other school requests that were made with the original application.

G. DEMOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS

1. Each dual-immersion program will attempt to have an equal number of ELL and Special Education students by grade level as is present in the English classrooms.

Board members were in favor of the plan and supported moving forward with implementation where possible during the 2015-2016 school year with full implementation during the 2016-2017 school year.

16. Prospective State Board Replacements

The governor will make an appointment to the state board of education to fill the late Mark Openshaw's seat. They're willing to take suggestions from Provo/Nebo school districts. Provo wants to have someone friendly to public education with Board of Education/public school background rather than someone in favor of charter schools. Stan Lockhart had been approached to run for the board. Keith thinks it would be a good idea. Members of the Provo /Nebo school boards could be considered.

Recommendations:

- Bill Hulterstrom
- Chris Sorensen
- Stan Lockhart
- Deon Turley
- Fidel Montero
- Christian Faulconer
- Steve Densley
- Sue Curtis

Supt. Rittel and Nebo Superintendent Rick Nielsen will make suggestions for the appointment, which will likely take place within a week or so.

Miscellaneous item not on the agenda:

Supt. Rittel will draft a letter to senate/house leadership requesting an audit of growth money by the end of

the day Monday for board members to sign.

B. Adjourn

1. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the study session.

Motion by Taz Murray, second by Marsha Judkins.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

Not Present at Vote: Michelle Kaufusi

The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.